DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 103 FL 008 096

AUTHOR Foster, Joseph P.
TITLE Of Natural and Unnatural Dialect Differences: When the Standard Is the Deviant.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Case (Grammar); *Dialects; English; *English Instruction; *Language Usage; *Nonstandard Dialects; Regional Dialects; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; *Syntax

ABSTRACT

Current research in linguistic typology shows some syntactic processes, such as rightward dislocation of modifiers, to be characteristic of certain types of languages, and that a language of that type without such processes is "unnatural" and likely to develop them. For instance, almost all languages with order Verb-Object (VO) have dislocation rules of the kind which relate these sentences: (1) We got a tape which did nothing but hum from the President. (2) We got a tape from the President which did nothing but hum. Sentence (2) is generally regarded as ungrammatical in Prescribed Standard English (PSE), but since all English dialects are SVO, the version of PSE which disallows (2) is typologically deviant and teachers pushing this dialect will rarely be successful. Other syntactic processes appear typologically neutral. In Standard Highland English (SHE), for instance, simple subject pronouns are nominative (I went fishing.), but all others, including conjoined subjects, are in the accusative (Me and him went fishing.). Neither type appears more natural to VO languages than the other, and teachers do meet with some success in this area. But the usual teaching technique concentrates on the case marking of subjects and promotes the spread of a hybrid dialect in which conjoined objects enter the nominative case. Teaching success may improve by making SHE speakers more conscious of their own fundamental system, and then showing them how SE differs from it by ignoring conjunction altogether. (Author/KM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129103

OF NATURAL AND UNNATURAL DIALECT DIFFERENCES:

When the Standard Is the Deviant[1]

by

Joseph F. Foster

Department of Anthropology

University of Cincinnati

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

© Copyright 1976 by Joseph F. Foster

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph F. Foster

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

FL008096

To the extent to which language is a particular type of cultural phenomenon, the attempt to effect a change in some group's dialect or to augment someone's repertory of dialects may be taken as a special kind of directed culture change; and in this perspective, a good deal of applied linguistics is applied anthropology. This is more especially evident when we consider that such attempts are generally committed with the stated goal of increasing the number of situations in which the pupils can function in a way at least tolerable to people who normally engage in those target activities. In short, the pupils are to increase or modify their linguistic repertory to broaden their social opportunities.[2] There are some rather strong reasons for thinking that the extent to which we can intervene in and control cultures may be rather limited (White 1949), and it is interesting in this respect to ponder the remarkable lack of success of attempts to "control" language when rated against the caloric effort expended upon it over the decades in attempts to promote or prohibit language change. The two major examples to be studied in some detail below are phenomena in which the Prescribed Standard English (PSE) differs sharply from many of the colloquial dialects. Teachers and prescriptive grammarians have been long on interest in both these phenomena, but short on success in one and of limited, though noticeably greater, success in the other. Indeed, this second has yielded unanticipated and unintended results due largely to imperfect analysis. We will see how recent research in theoretical linguistic typology may account for these developments. The accounts given depend critically on the notion that some linguistic differences are <u>natural</u> while others are not.

Mindful of the times we live in and of Section 2c of the Code of Ethics of my profession,[3] let me make clear at the outset that the notion of naturalness has here the sense in which this notion (if not the term) is commonly used in science, and two extralinguistic examples will illustrate. First, most bodies in the universe revolve in counterclockwise direction as viewed from the North (Geographic, Heliacal, Galactic....) Pole. There are, however, a few known instances of bodies revolving in retrograde, i.e., clockwise. The most famous examples are probably Jupiter's outer moons and these bodies are in this sense unnatural in their motion--not because they are not the result of some natural process, but because they depart from the overwhelmingly normal state of affairs which there are theories to account for. The description of the outer Jovian moons must be therefore complicated with the insertion of special statements about their unnatural motion. In a sense, the "grammar" we devise to account for these moons has to "pay" in complexity for the privilege of their strange behavior.

Moving closer to home and our topic of interest, Man, most band and tribal level societies do not in their religious systems include monotheism in the sense of a single high god ultimately responsible for all things; and we have a theory (Swanson 1960) to account for the absence of such a belief in primitive societies. There appear however to be a few such societies in which this belief is present. In the view of cultural anthropology in which we want as much as possible about cultures to be in our general theory and will state in ethnographies of particular cultures only the incidental and unpredictable details, the description of such "unnatural" cultures must be complicated with a special statement about an unpredictable aspect of their belief systems.[4] In this line of development then, an

unnatural characteristic is one exhibited by some phenomenon which renders it statistically atypical from some pattern exhibited by other phenomena of its class, particularly in instances where the science has advanced to the point of generating a theory to account for the pattern. It should be clear from both the examples and definition that the equation of natural with good and unnatural with bad is unwarranted. We have no more basis for characterizing the primitive Lengua as "bad" for having a single creator god than we have the outer Jovian moons as "bad" for moving in retrograde.

Turning now to language itself, it may help pave the way if we first look at some analogous examples in an area interesting yet unlikely to be socially controversial--phonology. In general, nonlow back vowels are articulated with lip rounding whereas front vowels are not. There are, however, many languages such as German, French, and Turkish which have round front vowels and there are a number, Russian and Turkish for instance, which have unround high back vowels. From what we know of linguistic change, such "unnatural" (or marked (Chomsky and Halle 1968, Ch. 9)) vowels are very susceptible to replacement by or merger with a more natural type of vowel. We are not therefore surprised to learn that some French dialects (e.g., Cajun) and some German ones have lost their front round vowels. Thus we have Standard French [tü] tu 'you' but Cajun [ti]. In the framework of Markedness Theory, the grammar of Standard French had to "pay" for the privilege of having an unnatural vowel by being more complicated than the grammar of Cajun in this particular aspect. Here then is an instance in which the Standard is deviant from the situation we expect to obtain in languages while the nonstandard Cajun demonstrates the more normal system.[5]

A similar development has come about in German with the standard Schrift-deutsch (which may not be anybody's native dialect!) and some of the colloquial regional dialects preserving the [ö] and [ü] but others of the dialects changing them to [e] and [i].

One might suggest that in such instances, the conservatism of a standard dialect in a stratified society, particularly a literate one, would account for the unnaturalness of the standard dialect in contrast with the nonstandard ones which "more readily drift into the system they ought to have." We ought to be suspicious of such a proposition, however; because, first, there is some reason to think the upper strata change regularly too with the effective result of "keeping ahead sociolinguistically." In the case of French, some of the Cajuns who write standard French write t*u* and appear to think they're saying for this what Frenchmen say. Along the same line, Americans speaking German think they're hearing and saying [ʃēn] for schön, when what they're hearing is [ʃœ̄n]. That is, people whose languages don't have a round front vowel "hear" such vowels as though they were the homorganic unround equivalents. To correct for the difference in the case of the target vowel being the deviant one would seem in most instances to require overt teaching. But even stronger is the fact that there are instances in which it is the standard which has shifted toward the more natural system. Modern Welsh is such a case. In an earlier stage the high back round [u] became [ʉ́], as it remains in rural northern Welsh. The literary Southern has changed this to the more expected [i]; thus for orthographic fy nhadau 'my fathers', Northern Welsh has [vəhʉ́daɨ̯] but Southern [vəhʉ́dai].

Lest anyone be still uncomfortable with the notion that some linguistic variations are less natural than others and that some languages and dialects are odd in one or more respects, let me offer as schlagender Beweis the case of the implosive stops, or "clicks" of Southern Bantu and Bushman languages. These examples would destroy any linguistic theory which predicted the exclusion of imploded stops from the set of possible phonemes. Very nearly as bad, however, would be a theory which held such phonemes to as natural in languages as /p, t, k/. Those languages in South Africa are in this sense as deviant as Jupiter's moons. But lest anyone have got too comfortable with this notion of unnatural variation for the wrong reasons, again must I stress that we are in no position to suggest any value judgment about these differences--we can't even relate them to cultural complexity. The Zulu borrowed the Bushman clicks although their society was notably more complex than that of the Bushmen.

* * *

We can now turn to a syntactic characteristic of all colloquial dialects of English (including the colloquial standards) but one which textbooks and composition teachers have over the years tried to exterminate from Prescribed Standard English (PSE). For consideration here, it suffices to describe the phenomenon as a (set of) rule(s) which have the effect of moving elements to/toward the end of a sentence away from their complements. Such rules of Extraposition or of Rightward Dislocation relate the following pairs:

1a. We got a [tape [which did nothing but hum]] from the President.

1b. We got a [tape] from the President [which did nothing but hum].

2a. There pulled a [steamboat [which had come up to Cincinnati after forcing the Belle of Louisville aground]] into the dock.

2b. There pulled a [steamboat] into the dock [which had come up to Cincinnati after forcing the Belle of Louisville aground].

3a. The [weeks [that she spent learning to fly]] paid off.

3b. The [weeks] paid off [that she spent learning to fly].

It turns out that languages which have such movement rules tend to be verb-medial, that is, have their normal declarative sentences in the order Subject-Verb-Object (SVO). Rules which move elements all the way to the end of the sentence are rare in languages whose normal order is SOV, and indeed some such languages (Japanese) lack them entirely. But all SVO languages have such rules, as far as I am aware, and an SVO language which lacked them would be in this respect unnatural. Since PSE is supposed not to have a grammar capable of generating the (b) type sentences above, its promoters are pushing a deviant dialect and at the intended expense of closely related dialects which behave with respect to these phenomena like a verb-medial language "ought to." It is surely no accident that few people speak this version of PSE natively or are successful in learning it fluently as a second dialect.

An ingenious and lucid account has been suggested by Susumu Kuno (1974) of why we should expect such rules in grammars of SVO languages.[6] Note that in the (a) sentences above, the subordinate clause is in effect a sentence embedded in the center of another sentence, a phenomenon known in the literature as nesting, self-embedding, or the more recent and informative center-embedding. In the (b) sentences, the subordinate clause is instead

lateral-embedded, branching off in these cases to the right. Now, suppose that English had subordinate clauses precede instead of follow their head nouns as is the case in most verb-final languages. In that event, relative clauses modifying the subjects of sentences would be lateral--rather than center-embedded and they would branch off to the left. Relative clauses modifying objects as well as all other nouns coming after the verb would be left-branching too, however, and these would therefore be center-embedded. Verb-medial languages like English are thus assured of having many center-embedded sentences, but since in SVO languages most of the nouns (generally all save the subject and nouns in subject-modifying clauses) in the sentence follow the verb, the SVO language will get fewer center-embedded constructions by having relative clauses follow their head nouns. Many of the remaining center-embedded constructions can be converted to right lateral branching ones by adopting rules of rightward dislocation whose effects demonstrate in (1-3).

Obviously this theory hinges on there being something undesireable about center-embedding. Sentence (3a) offers a bit of a hint as to what that might be, for that sentence has two predicates in a row, and in decoding one must remember that the first predicate goes with the second noun to have been stated while the second predicate goes with the first noun. Sentence (3a) is a wee short one; the examples following show what happens when we get such structures with greater complexity:

4. [The classes [that the discipline [that the officer [whom some think is stupid] doesn't understand] offers] are in demand.]
5. [The women [whom the priest [whom the Bishop [who has threatened to resign] suspended] allowed to celebrate in his church's ordinations are irregular.]

Note how (5-OV) avoids center-embedding. Such a sentence in an OV language like Turkish would be much easier to comprehend than (5) is in VO languages like English.

5-OV. [[[[[The resign-to threatened-having] Bishop suspended] priest church-his-in celebrate-to allowed] women]'s ordinations irregular are.]

In short, compounded center-embeddings become rapidly indecipherable, particularly without pencil and paper. Rightward movement rules putting dependent clauses at the end of sentences are a way of avoiding such constructions. Since SVO languages potentially generate more center-embedded structures than do verb-lateral ones, it is not surprising that verb-medial languages should develop such rightward dislocation rules. Kuno in summary then suggests that languages, responding to difficulties caused by the basic word order of their primary constituents intersecting with human memory limitations, take measures to reduce to a minimum such difficulties. Kuno does not go on to suggest explicitly and is hereby absolved of any responsibility for my further proposal, namely that languages which fail to modify in this way are maladaptive for the species population using them. Other things equal, natural selection would favor languages which <u>do</u> so modify over those which do not. The corollary is that cultures unable to abandon such a language, for whatever reason(s), decrease their likelihood of survival.

Why then have prescriptivists worried about such sentences as (1-3b)? Apparently it is that such sentences are often funny due to an initial apparent ambiguity. The arguments run as follows: In (1b) we do not know from the sentence whether it was the tape or the President who was

humming. In (2b) we do not know from the sentence but what it was the dock which came up to Cincinnati. Such arguments are not only specious; they are foolish. First, the (1b) sentence could not be ambiguous to anyone who had heard of Watergate or Senator Sam--especially now that we've learned that while the tape did nothing but hum, the President did nothing but pray. Sentence (2b) could be ambiguous only if one had in mind a floating drydock. Second, if these sentences really are that confusing, why the mirth? The point is, of course, that they're not effectively ambiguous. Third, the very people who have worried about purging such forms from PSE are among the people who retain the dialect with the animate/inanimate distinction between the relative pronouns who and which. If we are to take them seriously, therefore, we must conclude that while (2b) must be ungrammatical in PSE, (1b) need not be so since which in their dialect (and mine, incidentally) must refer to tape as the other noun is animate. Finally, people worried about these dislocated phrases on the grounds of ambiguity are highly selective. Examples of style- and textbooks treating these matters are easy to find, but I have been unable to find such a book dealing with a dialect of PSE in which such sentences as (6) are regarded as ungrammatical.

6. They are teasing coeds.[7]

If Kuno's account of the proliferation of rightward dislocation rules such as extraposition in SVO languages and the implications I have drawn therefrom are right, we have in effect an explanation for why it seems so hard to teach English speakers a PSE dialect which forbids transportation of a relative clause away from its antecedent. Such transportation does sometimes result in ambiguities but most are contextually interpretable and the alternative as long as English dialects are SVO is to have

center-embedded structures. The problem with these is not that they can be assigned multiple interpretations but rather that once we get more than two, they can usually be assigned no interpretation at all. What's a language change director to do?

An obvious solution would be to make Prescribed Standard English over into a verb-lateral language. Since that probably won't catch on (but see Foster (forthcoming b)), the next most obvious solution is to give up and live with dislocated relatives. After all, the language developed them to get out of a difficulty without our intervention to help it and despite some attempts to thwart it. Indeed, people may be giving up on this one--I've found a couple of recent high school texts which evidently do not treat it. But the decision to refrain from intervention is not one that theoretical linguists are in a position to make. Indeed, it may be that parents, schoolboards, Newsweek editors and other people who wield power and worry about status and standardized tests will not allow anyone to make it. In this respect, the Anthropological Association's Ethical Statement has another interesting passage:

> d. As people who devote their professional lives to understanding man, anthropologists bear a positive responsibility to speak out publicly, both individually and collectively, on what they know and what they believe as a result of their professional expertise gained in the study of human beings. That is, they bear a professional responsibility to contribute to an "adequate definition of reality" [quotes theirs--JFF] upon which public opinion and public policy may be based. (Section 2, Professional Ethics)

There are those who would like us to teach special creationism on a par with evolutionary theory; most of us refuse. There are some who would like us to give the Tower of Babel equal time with Grimm's Law; few of us would comply. Our easy noncompliance in such matters once had to be fought for and may have again to be. King Canute had wisdom enough to know when

not to try to intervene in natural processes, but he was more fortunate than us. He could see the tide. The tide we are here discussing--the direction of linguistic drift and the natural processes which cause it--is poorly understood. As best we can judge this afternoon, part of that "adequate definition of reality" is a theory that predicts speakers of verb-medial languages like English will be unlikely to accept a prescribed standard dialect which severely restricts or prohibits altogether the right dislocation of subordinate clauses.

* * *

The danger in developing a new dichotomy (or a new name for an old one) is that we may forget how little we know and suddenly discover that everything fits it. We are in no position for ranking each and every dialect difference on a scale of naturalness, and certainly have no basis for running around rating languages and dialects on a scale of relative normality. Case-marking of English pronouns is a phenomenon in which some dialects differ noticeably, but although the trend, or Sapirean drift, seems fairly clear (see Traugott (1972) for a study in the framework of the concepts of generative grammar), I am not prepared to conjecture at which set of rules may be typologically the more natural, if either.

The tendency of English has been to generalize the oblique (objective, or accusative) case of the personal pronouns to more and more uses and to restrict nominative forms. Thus, while the "official" citation form is still in terms of the pronoun I, the actual absolute form is the accusative me as in "Why me?", or "Who's going?" "Him.". By the early 1960's the use of the accusative had become so pervasive that a rural Southern Highland school district could adopt a high school English textbook which dealt

kindly with It's me although recommending adherence to It is I for very formal writing. The case assignment rule (excluding genitives) is then for Standard English (SE) the following:

SE CASE ASSIGNMENT

Mark surface subjects as nominative case (I, she, etc.);
mark all other forms as accusative (me, her, etc.).

But early there had developed (Traugott 1972:126) dialects which generalized the accusative even to subjects under certain conditions, including coordinate conjunction. Southern Highland English (SHE) is the descendant of one of those dialects.

7.	SE	SHE
a.	She and I went fishing.	Me and her went fishin.
b.	He and I went fishing.	Me and him...
c.	Janey and I went shopping.	Me and Janey...
d.	He and Janey went shopping.	Him and Janey...
e.	I watched him and Janey fish.	I watched him and Janey a-fishin.
f.	Mother gave Janey and me some candy.	Mother gave me and Janey...

8.	SE	SHE
a.	I went fishing.	id. *Me went fishin.
b.	He went fishing.	id. *Him went fishin.
c.	We drove to Ft. Smith.	id. *Us drove...
d.	Sam saw me in the barbershop.	id. *Sam saw I...

The SHE case rule below will account for these data.

SHE CASE ASSIGNMENT

Mark single, simple subject pronouns as nominative;
mark all other pronouns as accusative.

The corollary is of course that pronouns in conjoined subjects are accusative.

This dialect difference has been a headache to generations of teachers of SE, though they have some measure of success here. That is, speakers of SHE and similar dialects appear to learn the SE system fairly readily so as to be able to use it in formal writing and speaking. I, for instance, to whom the SHE system is native, constantly extrapose relative clauses even in my writing but I normally do not use the SHE case rule. Teachers of SE to SHE pupils whom I have talked with indicate that this is not as big a hurdle for their pupils as some other differences, (Foster (forthcoming a)). But interestingly, there is yet another dialectal pattern which does seem to have been around long enough to have become native to some speakers, but which also occurs as an intermediate stage in the speech and writing of native SHE learning SE.

9. a. She saw Mary Lou and me. (rarely ...Mary Lou and I.)

   b. She gave good marks to Mary Lou and I.

   c. This was the first vacation in years for my wife and I.

We can generalize a case rule for this Acculturating Southern Highland dialect (ASH) as follows:

ASH CASE ASSIGNMENT

Mark all subjects and conjoined oblique objects as nominative; mark other pronouns accusative.

Examining these rules, we can readily see how such a hybrid system as ASH might arise as a product of linguistic acculturation. The SHE speaker learns that all subjects, in particular conjoined ones, are nominative in SE, but he retains the part of his own system which makes conjunction

relevant to case assignment. Forbidden to assign accusative case on the basis of conjunction, he rather naturally infers that nominative must then be assigned on the basis of conjunction. Why it seems generally confined to oblique and not direct objects I do not know.

The usual overt teaching technique reinforces such an inference, for it runs on the following order: "You wouldn't say *Me went, so why say Johnny and me went.?". The implied assumptions supporting such a technique are: a) conjunction and case marking are entirely separate phenomena in language, b) there is therefore no plausible answer to the posed question save "no reason", and c) SH speakers just talk that way because they don't know the rules. Sets (7 & 8) falsify assumption (c) because obviously there must be some rule which the starred forms in the SHE are violating. The most general rule we can formulate to account for that dialect takes conjunction into account thereby falsifying assumption (a) and transitively, assumption (b).

It might of course be the case that for a language to involve conjunction in its case assignment rules is highly unnatural. It is not obvious that this is so, however, for there are a number of languages similar to SHE in this respect. Standard French has three cases, nominative (je, il, etc.), objective (me, le/la, etc.), and oblique "disjunctive" (moi, lui, etc.). Nominatives are for single unconjoined subjects, objectives for objects, and disjunctives for objects of prepositions and all conjoined pronouns.

10. a. Je vois ta soeur. 'I see your sister.'
    b. Elle me voit. 'She sees me.'
    c. Viens avec moi. 'Come with me.'

(10, cont'd)

d. Donnez-moi le livre. 'Give me the book.'

e. Louise et moi, nous ne le voyons pas. 'Louise and me (, we) don't see it.'

f. Pourquoi moi? 'Why me?' Qui est-ce? Moi. 'Who is it' 'Me.'

I know of no evidence suggesting that it be unnatural for a language to include conjunction as a factor in case assignment. Coördinate conjunctions are surely semantic predicates and a language generalizing certain cases to apply to all postpredicative nouns, including equational ones, might well extend the generalization to cover conjoined pronouns too. In that event, we might characterize such dialects as SHE and French as being farther along in the direction of change, but we can hardly label SE as unnatural in this respect.

OV languages may be another matter. In them conjunctions are usually postpositions and often enclitic or even an integral part of the last conjunct word as a case suffix. Coördinate clauses are commonly in such languages conjoined with a conjunctive suffix on the verb of the first clause. The fact that OV languages generally have postpositions, that VO languages in which coördinate conjunctions precede the conjuncts are prepositional, and that case assignment is governed by post- and prepositions--all these considerations are very likely relevant to the phenomenon of conjunction and case marking in ways we do not yet understand.[8]

We can suggest a revision of teaching procedure for case marking in SE for pupils of native SHE or ASH. The usual concentration on subjects is understandable; in teaching foreign dialects and telling about foreign

cultures in general, one normally concentrates on the areas in which they differ from the systems the students are accustomed to. But the difference between SE and SHE in case marking of subjects is only a special superficial realization of the more critical fundamental difference, namely that in one conjunction is relevant to case assignment rules, while in the other it is not. This is one of those instances where better results might be got by first making the students consciously aware of how their own dialect works.

The case marking example suggests a modification of the usual intervention technique. The "misplaced modifier clause" example leads to the suggestion that we refrain from intervention. These are not as contradictory as they may seem. First, the considered and theoretically based decision not to apply some aspect of science is itself a decision in applied science (the conclusion that some phenomena are not subject to control being merely a special case). Second, while both these examples are in themselves of minor significance, they illustrate what might be accomplished with an adequate, comprehensive theory of language and linguistic variation. Both examples require the formulation and examination of rules for all the data. These examples will make little sense to people whose notions about the nature of linguistic rules have them derived from divine revelation, "best-educated [read literarily accomplished] masters," or metaphysical value systems; one by-product of such insupportable notions is the false conclusion that the dialects of powerless poor people don't have rules. (For typical and recent examples of such confusion, see Shiells (1975).) Unfortunately, such a view of man and his language is commonly held by people with the power to implement or reject suggestions of applied sciences. It may well be that the most productive

work in applied linguistics now is the pushing of our theoretical work to the point where we have a paradigm powerful enough to subvert and undermine the influence of those committed to humanistic or supernatural explanations of language. In this respect, basic linguistic research is applied linguistics; the development of naturalistic theories of Mankind's Languages and Cultures is applied anthropology.

Notes

1. This is a slightly revised version of a paper presented 2 April 1976 to the Kentucky Interdisciplinary Linguistics Conference at Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky.

2. The goal is the same even when put in terms of teaching "good grammar" to speakers with "poor grammar". The overwhelmingly predominant reason for wanting children to learn the standard dialect boils down to easing of entry into or protection of birth in middle or upper classes.

3. "In providing professional opinions, he [the anthropologist] is responsible not only for their content but also for integrity in explaining both these opinions and their bases." (Prof. Ethics 2c.)

4. In fairness and accuracy I should point out that this is not a common way for anthropologists to discuss what they do. I think it properly characterizes an underlying assumption they make about what they want to do, at least for those anthropologists interested in the development of explanatory culture theory as well as describing things.

5. Again must be stressed that this is not equivalent to the claim that Standard French is somehow "less a language", or has a more primitive phonology than Cajun. We do not claim the outer Jovian moons to be less than "true moons". They may have had a different origin from the others;

such an explanation is implausible for the French [ü] to [i] drift. Vowels can change in the natural universe; planets apparently cannot reverse their orbits.

In any case, natural vowels can change to unnatural ones. In Russian, e.g., all instances of the high back unround vowel [y] are modern reflexes of a previous long [u:]. The German odd round front vowels arose through the perfectly natural process of umlauting, a special case of regressive assimilation.

6. Note that the sentence you have just read is an example of rightward dislocation of a reduced relative clause beginning with ...of why.... The best general summary of syntactic universals of the type under consideration is Greenberg (1963).

7. It says much about the attitudes toward language our youth still grow up with when even after half a quarter of stressing to a class of upperclassmen and beginning graduate students that in linguistics we analyze how language is rather than pontificating about how it ought to be, their concern with such sentences is predominately how to correct them rather than how to account for them. The prescriptivists' inattention to such sentences as (6) is probably due to the fact that there are no movement rules relating the two homophonous sentences and the ambiguity is then much less salient.

8. Here are some examples of conjunction in an OV language, Osmanlı Türkish:

a. Rize-ye gid-ip, tabak satın al-dı-k.

Rize-to go-and then, tobacco sale take-PAST-we

We went to Rize and (then) bought some tobacco.

b. Sen(-de), ben(-de), kardeş-in-de ...

You (-and), me(-and), sibling-your-and....

You, me, and your sibling...

c. Ahmet, Doğan-da....

Ahmet, Doghan-and.

Ahmet and Doghan too.... (Note the vowel harmony in the morpheme -de/-da showing the conjuctive postposition to be an affix on the preceding word.)

d. Çalışmış-da, kazanmış.

Worked-and, won.

(He, she, it) worked, and (he, she, it) won.

Runnic (Ancient) Türkish had two conjunctions, both derived from verbs:

1. biriki 'and' from birik- 'join' + participle suffix = '-ing';
2. ula-yu 'connecting' from ula 'connect' + the vowel harmonic participial suffix.

References Cited

Chomsky, Noam and Morris Halle

1968 The Sound Pattern of English. New York: Harper and Row.

Foster, Joseph F.

to appear

a. On Southern Highland and Standard English in Schools: Contrastive Analyses and Teachers' Attitudes. IN H. C. Dillingham, ed.; Appalachians in Urban Areas: Myths, Facts, Questions.

b. Basic Word Order Change in Southern Highland English: A Speculation in Left-Center Field. MS.

Greenberg, Joseph

1963 Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. IN Jos. Greenberg, ed.; Universals of Language. Cambridge: MIT Press. 73-113.

Kuno, Susumu

1974 The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions. Linguistic Inquiry V.1: 117-36.

Professional Ethics

1971 Statements and Procedures of the American Anthropological Association. Adopted by the Council of Fellows May 1971. Washington, D. C.: American Anthropological Association.

Shiels, Merrill

1975 Why Johnny Can't Write. Newsweek 8 December: 58-65.

Swanson, Guy

1960 The Birth of the Gods: The Origins of Primitive Beliefs. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth

1972 The History of English Syntax. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

White, Leslie A.

1949 Man's Control over Civilization: An Anthropocentric Illusion. IN Leslie A. White, The Science of Culture. New York: Grove Press. 330-61.